



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/857,914	06/11/2001	Marnix Claudius Vlot	NL 000561	1219
24737	7590	12/10/2007	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS			BROWN, RUEBEN M	
P.O. BOX 3001			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			2623	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/10/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/857,914	VLOT, MARNIX CLAUDIUS
	Examiner Reuben M. Brown	Art Unit 2623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 April 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,3-11 and 13-20 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1, 3-11, 13-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
3. Claims 1, 3-4, 6-11, 13-14 & 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Terasawa, (U.S. Pat # 6,147,714), in view of Borseth, (U.S. Pat # 6,340,997) and Eyer, (U.S. Pat # 6,401,242).

Considering claim 1, the amended claimed method for assigning program locations in a receiver to individual received broadcast signals; the method comprising 'providing the broadcast signals with information about at least the transmitting network, a unique service

identification and a logical channel number', is met by the disclosure of Terasawa, (col. 8, lines 25-35). Terasawa discloses that the EPG includes the Service Description Table (SDT), which provides original_network_ID corresponds with 'transmitting network' and service_ID corresponds with unique service identification. The broadcast channel (program_number) corresponds with a logical channel number, see col. 7, lines 5-25; col. 7, lines 55-62; col. 10, lines 6-21 & Fig. 11A; for instance, in one embodiment up to 80 channels are transmitted in an EPG per 24 hour period.

The claimed 'method assigning in the receiver a program location in a program location list to the received broadcast signal in accordance to assignment rules based on the received information', is met by the disclosure in Terasawa that a EPG is transmitted as a Program Map Table, (PMT); col. 8, lines 1-12 & col. 10, lines 1-31.

As for the additionally claimed 'country of origin', Terasawa teaches that the SDT includes a list of countries that the service is available in, and those that cannot access the service, col. 8, lines 61-67 thru col. 9, lines 1-5, which is different from the claim. However Borseth, which is in the same field of endeavor, discloses a worldwide tuning system that attaches a country's ITU long distance telephone code to broadcast programming, col. 4, lines 50-63; col. 6, lines 58-67 & col. 7, lines 1-45. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Terasawa with the feature of attaching a country code to broadcast programming, for the desirable improvement of more

effectively allowing a user to tune to programs in different countries, while the receiver device is in a different country, as taught by Borseth, see col. 2, lines 35-67 thru col. 3, lines 1-15.

Regarding the amended claimed feature of service corresponding to received broadcast signal and identified by the unique service identifier of a given country preference and in case of conflict of logical channel numbers giving preference to any broadcast signal containing information of country of origin corresponding to a predetermined indication of country preference', the references do not discuss any preference indication feature. However, Eyer teaches that a user may choose a preference as to which service to receive/display, when there is conflict between multiple channels, Abstract; col. 6, lines 31-40; col. 7, lines 34-50. Thus, the combination of Terasawa, Borseth & Eyer provides for multiple services for a customer, such that if there are duplicate/conflicting services or channels, a preferred service or channel, may be selected, including if the conflict is with respect to multiple countries. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Terasawa & Borseth with the additional feature of a preferred service to select between conflicting channels, for the desirable benefit of being able to seamlessly integrate global and local programming from a plurality of disparate sources, as taught by Eyer, col. 2, lines 38-64 & col. 5, lines 1-23.

As for the claimed country of origin, this feature is met by the country code information found in Borseth, col. 7, lines 1-35. Therefore, the combination of Borseth & Eyer meets the claimed subject matter.

Considering claims 3-4, 7-8, 13-14 & 17-18, the claimed features reads on the discussion in Terasawa that programs may be grouped, forming 'a list of the countries that can access the service', in a regular EPG line-up, see col. 8, lines 61-67 thru col. 9, lines 1-5.

Considering claims 6 & 16, the claimed subject matter is met by the disclosure in Borseth that the user may set a regional preference for TV reception, col. 7, lines 9-12 & col. 10, lines 45-50.

Considering claims 9-10 & 19-20, the claimed subject matter reads on the PMT disclosed in Terasawa.

Considering claim 11, the claimed elements of a receiver for digital signals, corresponds with subject matter mentioned above in the rejection of claim 1, and is likewise treated.

4. Claims 5 & 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Terasawa; Borseth & Eyer further in view of Pon, (U.S. Pat # 6,272,343).

Considering claims 5 & 15, Terasawa does not discuss using the signal strength of a channel as a tuning parameter. Borseth teaches that if the quality of received signal is not optimal, the system may scan for the best possible signal, but does not explicitly state that strength is the parameter used, col. 8, lines 31-40. Nevertheless Pon, which is in the same field of endeavor of

wireless transmission, teaches that reception channels may be prioritized by signal strength, see col. 13, lines 25-50. Also see Fig. 5 (106&106). Arrange channels in order of Highest received signal level to Lowest received signal strength; Select First channel on the list, (Highest received signal strength). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Terasawa with the feature of prioritizing channels according to signal strength, for the desirable benefit of fast signal acquisition, as taught by Pon.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- A) Thibadeau Transmission/reception of programming based on geographic ID.
- B) Kwoh Teaches a user selecting a preferred language for receiving TV programming.

Art Unit: 2623

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(571) 273-7290 (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Reuben M. Brown M. Brown whose telephone number is (571) 272-7290. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F(8:30-6:00), First Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300 for regular communications and After Final communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Reuben M. Brown


REUBEN M. BROWN
PATENT EXAMINER